



COMMUNITY SERVICE

NEWSLETTER

Volume XXXVIII Number 2
March/April 1990
ISSN 0277-6189

COMMUNITY SERVICE NEWSLETTER is published six times a year by Community Service, Inc. Our purpose is to promote the small community as a basic social institution involving organic units of economic, social and spiritual development.

New Land Reform

by Tom Watson

The following article first appeared in the November 4, 1989 issue of Creative Loafing.

More Atlanta communities are adopting land trusts, a concept that is being called "corrective capitalism" by some housing experts.

For years, Cabbagetown native Patsy Clontz worried that she would have to leave the historic mill village where she grew up. Unable to afford a house and renting from a "slumlord," she saw newcomers buying up property around her and rent skyrocketing out of her price range. But last June, through an innovative land use concept implemented in Cabbagetown, she realized the American dream of home ownership. For \$45,000 she bought a brand-new, two-story, three-bedroom house on Savannah Street from the Cabbagetown Revitalization and Future Trust.

"These new people coming in don't want Cabbagetown people here, and what made Cabbagetown was the people," Mrs. Clontz says. "If all the people from Cabbagetown were gone, there wouldn't be a Cabbagetown."

Mrs. Clontz got a deal on the house, priced just above construction costs. What she didn't get was the land beneath the house.

CRAFT is one of four Atlanta nonprofit community corporations called land trusts. The

organizations are committed to providing permanent affordable housing while putting skids on gentrification in redeveloping neighborhoods.

Too often, says CRAFT director Starling Sutton, the original residents of low-income neighborhoods get squeezed out when the improvements made by the more prosperous newcomers raise property values and rents beyond their reach.

Sutton, as a co-founder of the Virginia-Highland Civic Association in the early '70s when banks wouldn't risk home loans in that then-declining neighborhood, saw firsthand how an entire segment of a community can be displaced during its rebound.

"What we did then was good and necessary, but what we weren't aware of was the gentrification issue," Sutton says. "We're now trying to take a more complete approach, and we're learning to rebuild a neighborhood in a way that doesn't cause displacement. Land trusts are the best method of doing that."

Land trusts work on the premise that if a community controls its land, it controls its future. Threatened with gentrification, Cabbagetown activists and longtime residents formed CRAFT in 1987 and began buying property with a \$53,000 community development grant from the CSX Railroad. They set about

building six new homes and renovating four more, which they sold to low-income residents at nearly cost.

Profits from the sales go into the pool to buy more land that is put in trust. Home buyers get a 99-year lease on the land with the stipulation that CRAFT has first buy-back option, and, if they sell to another person, they can sell only for the price they paid for the house, plus 36 percent of the structure's accrued value.

"This stops all speculation; the land is held in trust and speculators can't come in, buy it and drive up prices," Sutton says. "We've created a partnership ownership in which individuals get the security of home ownership and the community gets social and economic stability."

CRAFT now owns 37 parcels of land--about a tenth of Cabbagetown--and plans to build and renovate 300 houses during the next five years as it acquires more land. CRAFT home buyers must be low- to middle-income with steady jobs and good credit. Cabbagetown residents get first priority.

The Rev. Craig Taylor, director of Progressive Redevelopment Inc., a nonprofit corporation that provides consultation for beginning and ongoing land trusts in Atlanta, says that land trusts are the most sensible way to provide a permanent stock of affordable housing. Rules of perpetuity, he explains, prohibit permanent restrictions on property that is sold.

For example, he says, when Habitat for Humanity sells someone a house at cost, the buyer can only be restricted from selling the house at market value for 20 years. After that time, the owner can realize a "gargantuan" windfall profit and that house falls from the affordable housing ranks.

"If we hold the land in trust and never sell it, we can control the cost of the land," Taylor says. "Then we build a house on the land and sell it. Since we own the land, we have in the land lease a way to control how much that unit is sold for and the housing on the property becomes a community asset which is available to future generations at affordable prices."

Owners of land trust houses have exclusive use of the land and can will the house to their children. Their only real restriction is not being able to sell the house at market value.

Land trusts take aim at speculative realtors who buy up land in struggling neighborhoods with an eye on turning a large profit down the road, Taylor says. It gets down to a matter of ethics, he explains, that weighs the value of an individual's right to hold onto a vacant piece of property for years to realize a profit, or to use that land in a way that benefits a larger segment of society.

There is room in Cabbagetown for land trust home ownership and traditional individual ownership, Sutton says. CRAFT is not trying to take over the neighborhood, but to create a balanced social/economic mix that will contribute to the health of the entire community. CRAFT, he says, is applying a holistic approach to the redevelopment of Cabbagetown that first ensures residents' existence there through land trust home ownership. Then education and training programs can be introduced that help the community grow.

Though some critics of land trusts say the concept smacks of socialism, Taylor disputes that notion, saying that land trusts glean the best from American market economy--ownership--and put it to greater use. "I'm not a socialist in any way, shape or form; I like the private incentive," he says. "This is a corporate body of people who own that property--the American way. It's not the government, it's individual citizens who own and lease the land."

Taylor started with the South Atlanta Land Trust in 1983. Residents of this historic, predominantly black neighborhood near Atlanta-Fulton County Stadium were feeling threatened by encroachment and didn't want any more of their borders gobbled up by a trucking company on one side and the city of Atlanta on the other.

Then a recent graduate of Emory University Seminary, Taylor had become active in inner-city neighborhoods and set about helping the south Atlanta community form a land trust. Since that time, SALT has built nearly 70 housing units with plans to construct 30 to

50 more in 1990. SALT owns about 85 parcels of land, close to 30 percent of the neighborhood, and hopes to add about 60 more lots to its "land bank."

"This neighborhood is more than 100 years old, with some residents who have lived here for 60 years," says SALT director Barbara King-Rogers. "Their sense of pride brought them together and they said, 'We're not going to allow our neighborhood to be taken from us.'"

SALT has given security to older south Atlanta residents and attracted younger people back into the neighborhood who have contributed to its revitalization. A stronger sense of community has developed. Rather than residents thinking of themselves in terms of owning an individual piece of the neighborhood, they share more of an interest by being part of a collective ownership.

After seeing what the land trust concept has done for south Atlanta, King-Rogers is convinced land trusts can reverse the fortunes of other declining inner-city neighborhoods. Part of the problem, she says, is that these neighborhoods have been written off with the label "poor." "If people would pump some life back into these neighborhoods where they, or their parents, used to play as children, they would be surprised how fast these neighborhoods would turn around."

The land trust concept was introduced by the Institute for Community Economics (ICE) in Greenfield, Mass., in 1967. Land trusts caught on during the '70s, but didn't really start rolling until the mid-'80s, driven by an increasing need for affordable housing, says ICE director Chuck Matthei. By 1986, 19 land trusts had formed in the nation. Since then 52 more incorporated.

As the primary advocate of land trusts, ICE provides instructional assistance and has set up a lending program for beginning land trusts. ICE put together its loan program in 1979, attracting investments of about \$40,000 in the first few years. After nearly 10 years, the program has lent over \$15 million to 240 land trusts projects in 28 states. ICE now has over 500 individual, institutional and corporate investors, including the Episcopal Church and the Ford

Foundation, which calls the land trust concept a form of "corrective capitalism."

On the local level, Southeastern Reinvestment Ventures, Inc. (SERV), a nonprofit lending organization, similarly provides land trust loans. SERV development consultant Susan May says the 2-year-old corporation has acquired about \$600,000 in lending capital and made loans totaling \$400,000 at 6 to 9 percent interest. The Atlanta Mortgage Consortium, another nonprofit corporation, makes home loans to individual land trust house buyers.

Matthei says that for the first time in our history the percentage of home ownership is decreasing as fewer people can afford to buy. Coupled with this housing dilemma is a federal budget deficit that is drawing government purse strings tighter. Rather than spending government money on ever-increasing traditional public housing subsidies, he says that money could be put to better use in the one-time investment of land trusts.

"We are facing an historic housing crisis today in which the need for affordable housing is rising," Matthei says. "But at the same time we have an historic budget deficit. The problem is, how do you make the most prudent and effective use of limited resources.

"We need to recognize the partnership that exists in property. The individual owner is a partner with the community as a whole and both contribute over time to property value," Matthei says. "It is really a kind of American land reform that can continue to make the American dream come true for new generations."

Some government bodies have decided that land trusts offer practical alternatives: The states of Vermont and Connecticut have set up grants and loan programs for land trust start-ups; Maine has a referendum vote coming up that contains land trust funding; the city of Burlington, Vt., recently invested \$1-million of its employees pension fund into a land trust loan program; the Farmers' Home Administration has agreed to start making home loans on land trust houses; the cities of Boston and New York have agreed to turn over tax-defaulted property in low-income areas for land trust use.

While land trusts offer a rather radical solution to a growing problem, Sutton believes they will proliferate as more people get used to the idea. "We know what we have done here in Cabbagetown is on the leading edge of the nation," he says. "We would like to see it become a model for other cities."



Community Land Trust

The following article first appeared as a School of Living position paper June 1988. It has been slightly condensed.

Land belongs to a vast family of which many are dead, few are living and countless members are still unborn.

-- A Nigerian tribal saying

The Community Land Trust concept was formed out of the underlying principle, which has been accepted by most people throughout most of history, that: land and its resources are given to all of us. Thus, it might be said to be owned by all of us in common. The private ownership concept applied to land is a very recent historical event.

What is important about this concept is not that each person should have an equal amount of equally good land, but rather that each person should be entitled to a fair share of the return on land and its resources. Most and maybe all wealth comes from land and its resources. The major disparity between the rich and the poor has its roots in the private accumulation of land resources, which has given a few the bulk of the economic advantage from its use and impoverished many.

Marx saw the solution as State Ownership. But this has only resulted in the bureaucrats who run the state getting most of the benefit with incentive drained from the rest. Henry George clearly saw that it was not ownership or use rights that created the disparity but rather the maldistribution of income resulting from ownership and use rights. He saw a mechanism already in place whereby local governments could collect a tax on land and its resources equal to the annual economic value of the resource and that such tax could either be used to

support all public functions or, as some have proposed, could be distributed to each member of society. Under such a system, who owned and used the land made little difference, so long as the economic value was justly distributed among all....

Since governments have been reluctant to institute a land value tax in proportion to the actual value of the land (except in some isolated and very successful instances), it was the idea of Ralph Borsodi (based on Gandhian Trusterty principles) to accomplish the same goal through private initiative, and the Community Land Trust was born.

The word "Land," as used in Community Land Trust, refers to Land and all of the natural resources under or on the land, before human modifications. Land does not refer to improvements and human-made structures. The concept is to collect economic rent on the common heritage but to free human labor, human ingenuity and resourcefulness of all tax-rent burdens. In such a system each person would receive their fair share of the natural heritage, collected from users as rent fees, plus 100% of the value of their individual labor and energy.

The first reason for the use of the term "Community" is to differentiate between private trusts that are owned and controlled by the users of the land, and Community Trusts which allow great input from users but which cannot be changed or dissolved by the users alone. History has proven that private land trusts do not last because their purposes are subverted by the profit motive or other private interests of individual users. The Community Land Trust is controlled by members of the general community, which may include, but must not be limited to, users.

The second reason for the use of the word "Community" is to define a geographical area ... Most of us involved in Community Land Trusts believe in decentralized structures and favor small trusts limited to something not larger than a bio-region and in many cases to a County, State or other small geographical region, where local Community control is possible. However the Community is defined, the members of the trust should represent the interests of that Community while being equally fair to the users of trust land.

The concept of Trust as used by the Community Land Trust is rather different from that understood by lawyers in their legal definition of "trust." The members of the Community Land Trust elect trustees. The trustees have a threefold obligation: protect the use rights of users as defined by a lease agreement, distribute the economic rent collected on the land in an equitable manner in the community, and protect the natural resource itself from ecological abuse and human devastation. These trust duties are spelled out in the bylaws of the Community Land Trust and in the lease agreements between the Trust and the users.

One of the things which have led to our present condition of private ownership of land resources, which should be community owned, has been a confusion of terms. For example, the legal definition of "real estate" means the land and all of the resources under or attached to it, including man-made improvements such as houses and factories. Likewise the term "property" often confuses real property, which comes under the heading of "real estate," and personal property. At one time even human beings were considered to be property which could be bought and sold. The battle over ownership of human beings has been or is being won in favor of freedom. The next major revolution must be over distribution of profits from land.

Unfortunately the confusion over ownership of nature-given resources still remains. Even in some Community Land Trusts this confusion still exists, with little or no differentiation between man-made assets which should be properly the subject of commerce and nature-given resources which should be regarded as "Trusterty" and not as private property.

Since most Community Land Trust land is for human use, it usually involves homes and improvements. Some trusts have included these improvements in the lease agreements in a way that confuses land and improvements. We believe that improvements should belong to and be under the control of the users, subject only to ecological and abuse restrictions. The Community, as a land steward, has no legitimate interest in living arrangements, who lives on the land, housing, or improvements except for the impact

on the land itself and the possible impact on the collection of the economic rent from the land. Housing and improvement issues should be separated from natural resource issues, and mixing them together only contributes to the general confusion.

Some Community Land Trusts have used the CLT as a vehicle for providing low-cost housing. We believe that low-cost, subsidized housing should be provided, if that is the goal of the organization. But it would best be done with separate arrangements and agreements, and they should be called Community Housing Trusts or Community Development Trusts.

Access to land, even low-cost access, may in some circumstances be a byproduct of the Community Land Trust. It should be pointed out that if that low-cost access deprives the other members of the community of their fair share of the rent, then we have in reality perpetuated the present system. In the long run, artificial price and cost controls on either housing or land, which are not in line with market forces, will work themselves out in private individuals reaping the economic profit from community resources. The lease agreement should provide for adjustments to the lease fee in order to give the community the benefit they are entitled to as times and prices change, and prevent the privatization of Community resources through the incorporation of land values into housing and improvement values. The CLT becomes part of the problem instead of part of the solution when it adopts policies to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Land can be liberated from the yoke of private ownership and moved into a permanent state of Community Trusterty. It is not fair to ask a person or a group of people to liberate a particular piece of land and then, in addition, to pay the Community for use rights. The approach which the School of Living has favored has been to exempt the donor and/or donor family or group from use/rent fees during their lifetime. In the case where the Trust already owns or buys the land, then a fair use/rent fee equal to the economic rent should be paid by all users.

The purpose of the Community Land Trust was not and should not be to provide benefits to the few at the expense of the many. It was

and should be to provide fair-share benefits for all. In that context it is indeed a long-range solution to many problems such

as poverty amidst plenty, unfair and unequal distribution of unearned wealth and the disincentive created by taxing human effort.

Small Towns USA: A Vanishing Breed

by Paul Greenberg

Paul Greenberg is editorial page editor of the Pine Bluff Commercial (Ark). The following article is © 1989 by Los Angeles Times Syndicate and is reprinted with permission.

The small town is a microcosm of the world.

To paraphrase what Leo Tolstoy said about families, happy small towns are all alike; every unhappy one is unhappy in its own way. A recent conference on the American small town at, appropriately enough, Grinnell College in Grinnell, Iowa, indicates that the American small town is alive and, if not well, hanging on gamely. That's good to hear, because one suspects that, as small towns go, so does America.

Even a professional skeptic like Thorstein Veblen said as much when he observed that the "country town is one of the great American institutions, perhaps the greatest in the sense that it has had...a greater part than any other in shaping public sentiment and giving character to American culture."

Perhaps the only disturbing thought on reading of a conference on small town life is that this country may honor certain social institutions only when they're about to disappear. The air of nostalgia that hovers over such gatherings may be pleasant, but nostalgia generally concerns the past, not the future.

If Grinnell is any example, small towns have not changed much, which is encouraging. Thomas Rawls wrote a piece about the conference for Harrowsmith magazine out of Charlotte, Virginia, and he tells about his reception in Grinnell: "I'm standing on the corner of Fourth and Broad in Grinnell, Iowa, and generally gawking. As I look things over, in apparent befuddlement, a kindly woman inquires: 'You look confused. Can I help you?' 'Oh, uh, no, thank you,' I reply, because however confused I appear, I am no more puzzled than usual. I'm just

taking in the scenery. Then as I amble up Broad Street on an unseasonably warm day, the first two people I pass on the sidewalk smile and say hello. They don't merely nod or mutter an unintelligible greeting; they offer a genuine salutation."

Sounds a lot like Pine Bluff, or certainly what Pine Bluff used to be and still, thankfully, often is--a place where a greeting is still a greeting and not a cursory half-smile and ambiguous sound. Where people's eyes still meet, that's a small town. The first rule on the New York subway is never to engage anyone else's eyes; it might set up a human relationship, with all its terrifying possibilities.

Fellow we know still remembers his first morning in Pine Bluff back in the early '60s, when he walked out of the Hotel Pines looking for the old Commercial building up Main Street and asked for directions from the first man he saw. The man, a grizzled old-timer dressed in khaki, didn't just point over his shoulder and hurry on. He came to a full stop. He commented on the weather. He took our friend by the arm and pointed him in the right direction, counted off the number of blocks he would need to traverse, wished him a good day, and watched him on his way. Fellow seeking directions knew he was home.

At Grinnell, the symposium on small-town life is full of such impressions. Distinguished speaker after distinguished speaker remembers growing up in a small town and asserts that's what growing up should be like. Why? To quote Mr. Rawls, "Boys and girls grow up in a mingling of rich and poor, in a place where, to make things work, people must participate. They move among adults who know them and learn what it takes to earn their respect." As one speaker at the conference puts it, "You see how everything works. You can understand the whole system."

The object of all the striving in the country's great megaplexes seems to be to get away from the poor. That being impossible in a small town, people tend to concentrate on better things. The small town is the world in microcosm. Institutions like the church, the public school system, the boys' club, all play their part in this process of E Pluribus Unum.

The number of American leaders produced by small towns isn't just a cherished myth; it's a statistical finding. Try to think of American presidents who came from large cities; you can count them on the fingers of one hand and have two or three fingers left over.

One troubling aspect of conferences like Grinnell's is that the distinguished leaders who recall their youth so fondly on these occasions aren't likely to live in small towns now that they're distinguished leaders. There are some glorious exceptions, but it's assumed that the best and brightest will move on and up.

Paul Gruchow, a writer from Worthington, Minnesota, calls that assumption "one of the central themes of small-town life," and tells a story that will ring true to every small-towner: When a hometown boy was involved in a murder elsewhere, the towns-people rallied to defend him, and started looking for a good lawyer. Paul Gruchow's wife happens to be a defense attorney of some experience and expertise. So one night he gets a phone call from a fellow townsman asking if he knows a good lawyer in Minneapolis.

The classic small-town inferiority complex seems to remain the same whether you're in Worthington, Minnesota, or Pine Bluff, Arkansas. We don't give ourselves enough credit, which may explain both the apathy and boosterism that seem to alternate in small towns. The sociologists have accepted the American small town as a remarkable place ever since the Lynds did their landmark study of Muncie, Indiana, in the 1920s, but the people who live there may never have come to terms with their own quality. That absence of self-consciousness, sometimes even self-awareness, makes small towns revealing even at their supposed dullest.

Forget all the leaders that small towns are supposed to produce for the rest of America, and consider only the village atheist, the town accentric, the lone aginner. Each has a character all his own that their city cousins lack. Perhaps the solitary nature of their calling in a small town explains it; their idiosyncrasies are not diluted by having to be shared with masses of non-conformists.

It would be hard to imagine William Faulkner or Maxwell Anderson writing as they did about great cities, or Thomas Wolfe celebrating America as he did if he had come from any place larger than Asheville, North Carolina. There is a special, personal quality about the small-towner--whether leader or freethinker, conformist or non--that comes with the limited territory, and that only the lucky few may be able to find in Big-city, U.S.A.

Now there is a new interest in the American small town. It's good to read about conferences on the subject. But something tells me that conferences and everything that goes with them--master plans, sociologese, federal grants--will be of peripheral use at best in saving whatever quality it is that draws us to small towns. Social planning may be able to produce an unreasonable facsimile of a small town, an architectural style, a big city on a small scale--but not the genuine article. Bureaucracy has its benefits, but it never produced a soul. You can no more create an instant small town than you can create instant history or instant character.

All help will be gratefully accepted, but in the end small towns will have to be saved by the people who live there. And isn't that part of small-town wisdom? Weren't you always told that there are some things nobody can do for you?





Book Review

THE NEW AGE COMMUNITY GUIDEBOOK: ALTERNATIVE CHOICES IN LIFESTYLES. 4th Edition. Harbin Springs Publishing, P.O. Box 82, Middletown, CA, 95461. 1989. 128 pp., paper. Available from Community Service for \$9 postpaid.

John W. Blakelock

Intentional Communities can probably be easily differentiated from the "communities" most of us grew up in. I would characterize most western population centers as "haphazard," or exploitive communities, springing up alongside rail lines or highways or resources to be raped and spreading willy-nilly like mold on an orange.

I find it a revolutionary concept that a group of people could get together and say, "This is what a society should be and should do for its people." And this book is full of communities that have done just that.

Revolutionary, but not new. You could say our founding fathers, the framers of the constitution, set up an intentional community. Of course, it seems to have gotten out of hand. Or at least strayed from the path. But, periodically, we have leaders like Lincoln or Roosevelt or Kennedy or Dr. King who attempt to lead us back. And when they make their stirring speeches, the image they evoke is of the intention of our forefathers and mothers.

In the opening pages of this guidebook Joy Foster asks the question: "What has happened to the flower children of the sixties and seventies?" We all know of the casualties and the sellouts. But Dave Thatcher, of 100 Mile House, an intentional community located in British Columbia, maintains there is a third group. These people have been working silently and diligently to fashion their vision of reality. In Thatcher's words, they have "come of age in the mature assumption of responsibility as global citizens."

And the movement is global. This book lists communities in Australia, Belgium, Canada,

Central America, etc., as well as in 36 states and the District of Columbia. As the cynics amongst us might expect, California and Oregon lead the pack in the number of intentional communities within their boundaries. I was surprised to find half a dozen listings for places here in Ohio, including The Vale, near Yellow Springs.

You can find a few threads which seem universal through the nearly 250 communities mentioned in this guidebook: organic farming, self-sustaining, pacifism. There are ten listed as being only for WOMYN (I would appreciate being enlightened as to whether this spelling changes the pronunciation). There are Jewish communities, Jesuit communities, Buddhist, and Krishna ones.

Service to the wider community seems to be a pervasive goal in these groups. There are communities like Friends of the Retarded and Camphill Villages which take care of retarded people, groups that care for children with AIDS, and communities which help Central Americans escape their troubled lands.

This book is pleasant to read, opening with essays by various authors. There are expanded articles about a selection of the communities. The book then lists communities by state and by country.

It features some handy tips on etiquette for those interested in visiting intentional communities; when writing send a self-addressed stamped envelope, don't call collect, and, if you drop in unannounced, you're likely to receive a less than warm reception.

If you're like me--homesick for the sixties--then you should find this book to be a spiritual shot in the arm. The women's movement, the environmental movement, the pursuit of higher consciousness are alive and well, have taken root and are thriving throughout the land and across the seas. Folks just decided to put their hands and backs and minds to the task.

After reading this book, I was ready to sell the house, pack up my family in a motorhome and start an endless pilgrimage from one community to the next.

New Life Communal Farm Network

by Mark Sidles

Our approach to development considers the ultimate or ethical goal of society to be human social evolution leading to a deepening of the human experience. The world needs social and spiritual growth with equity and in harmony with nature. We believe the creation of such a world will only occur if people abandon cities and return to small-scale natural farming and rural crafts-making. People are social creatures and so must measure their progress in social terms. We use the terms social and spiritual development interchangeably as each is the catalyst and glue-bond for the other. Social development is not possible without spiritual growth, yet spiritual growth will become weakened if isolated and not surrounded by a harmonious community.

Economic growth can lead to socio-spiritual development if the fruits of increased productivity are used for non-material needs satisfaction such as schools, health maintenance, sanitation, better housing, environmental protection and increased leisure time for community participation.

The purpose of individual lives and human development should be the cultivation of enlightenment and social harmony... But the nuclear family and capitalism with its uncontrolled competition and acquisitiveness are pathological, as is Soviet-style bureaucratic socialism. Only a total reconstruction of human lifestyles, attitudes, ethics, goals, property relations and social and economic structures can hope to salvage what is left of our planetary ecosystem. We need to live communally or in circumstances where sharing and mutual aid are naturally practiced. Local participatory democratic planning of the production of basic necessities should replace most of what is currently referred to as politics and democracy.

Permaculture provides us with both a method for designing sustainable agricultural systems and a set of universally applicable ethical principles:

1. Care of The Earth: Provision for all life systems (plants, land, water, air).

2. Care of People: Provision for people to have access to those resources necessary for their existence.
3. Setting Limits to Population and Consumption: By governing our own needs we can set resources aside to further the above.
4. Cooperation not competition is the very basis of future survival.
5. A Policy of Responsibility: The role of beneficial authority is to return function and responsibility to people.
6. Information is the critical potential resource only when obtained and acted upon.
7. Work With Nature Rather Than Against it.
8. Oppose all Further Disturbance of Remaining Natural Forests: Return much of current crop land back to forests.
9. NLCFN Addendum: Rightlivelhood: One's means of gaining a livelihood must be not kill or harm living things.

Bill Mollison, Permaculture One: A Perennial Agriculture For Human Settlements, 1978, and Permaculture Two, 1982, available for \$17.50 each; The Natural Way of Farming: The Theory and Practice of Green Philosophy, Tokyo, Japan Pub., 1985, \$15.95; The Road Back To Nature, Tokyo, Japan Pub., 1987, \$17.95. All are available from Permaculture Communications, Box 101, Davis, CA, 95617. For information on a training program, contact Aprovecho Institute, 80574 Hazelton Road, Cottage Grove, OR, 97424; 503/942-9434.

Our present mission priority at NLCFN is to locate land and establish a research and communications center which will serve as a demonstration farm/commune/permaculture system design as well as a training facility.

We only require 5 or 10 hectares of land for the center, as we expect to do many of our demonstrations through cooperating local farmers. We also need 10 or 20 more people who are attracted to the vision and principles we are cultivating. For more information write to NLCFN/Mark Sidles, 3401 N. Columbus #8-0, Tucson, AZ 85712; 602/327-5041. Send \$1 to receive the quarterly newsletter or \$15 to become a supporting member and receive monthly updates.

If we don't change our direction, we will end up where we are headed!



Readers Write

ABOUT THE NEWSLETTER

It is time to let you know how very much I appreciate receiving Community Service Newsletter six times each year, both for the content and for the connection it provides to my Morgan family in Yellow Springs. We are fortunate to enjoy warm friendships with all of our neighbors in accord with ideals nurtured in the pages of C. S. N.

Dan Bolling, Silver Spring, MD

ABOUT BACK ISSUES

As a brand new subscriber to the Community Service Newsletter, I want to let you know how much I enjoy it. I'm writing to ask about the availability of back issues. What issues are available, how much do they cost, and what is the ordering procedure?

Charles Anderson, Fort Collins, CO

ABOUT "SELF-DIRECTED SMALL COMMUNITIES"

I'm enclosing a check to become a member and receive your Newsletter. I saw your listing in New Age Journal's Jan/Feb issue; in it they mention a recent article on "Self-Directed Small Communities." If possible, I would love to receive the issue in which that article appeared, as well as any other info about your organization. ("Community" is my favorite new word.)

Linda Francis, Orono, ME

ABOUT THE COHENS' ARTICLE

Here's Shannon Farm's 1990 dues for CSI membership. I enjoy reading the CS Newsletter. The Cohen piece on founding communities was thoughtful and helpful to me (Jan-Feb '90 issue).

Dan Christenberry, Afton, VA

ABOUT WILLIAM ELLIS'S ARTICLE

I have thoroughly enjoyed William Ellis's piece on Reciprocity Economics VS Exchange Economics (CSN, Dec.1989) because I read it when I was writing a piece on Voluntarism vis-a-vis Voluntary Organizations and, I find his appreciation for alternative human values cherished in East as very appropriate.

Reciprocities have other properties as well:

1) Lower down we go, in terms of settlement, social groups etc., longer is the time frame in which social, political and institutional reciprocities are treated.

2) More vulnerable the region to environmental risks (drought, flood), greater will be the number of resource, skill and information markets in which reciprocities are embedded.

3) Reciprocities can transform space/time/feeling relationships if emotive relationships are incorporated.

4) "Aparigrah"--a concept in Jain/Hindu religion implying not accumulating more than one's bare minimum needs coupled with charity brings about a "safety net" of reciprocities.

5) The term "resource poor" marks the richness poor people have in terms of development of a calculus of reciprocities which become weaker as one becomes affluent.

With greetings and appreciation for the paper.

Anil K. Gupta, Vastrapur, Ahmedabad, India

Announcements

BACKYARD ORGANIC GARDENING WORKSHOP

Together Jim Schenk and Jerry Ropp have almost 75 years of home gardening experience. The basis of the workshop will be to show that high garden yields can be obtained through wise and innovative stewardship of nature's resources, rather than relying on chemical fertilizers, pesticides, miracle seeds or expensive machinery.

Workshops will be held April 17, 24 and May 1 from 6:30-8:30 PM. Cost: \$10 per session, \$25 for all (20% discount for IMAGO members). For more information contact IMAGO, 553 Enright Avenue, Cincinnati, OH 45205; 513/921-5124.

FOR CONSCIENCE SAKE

Through Dorothy Andersen of the Pima Friends Meeting in Tucson, Arizona, we have acquired some remaindering copies of the novel For Conscience Sake by Solomon Stucky, Mennonite author and scholar.

John F. Stoner, Executive Secretary, U. S. Peace Section, Mennonite Central Committee says: "For Conscience Sake recounts the conscientious objection of three generations of a Mennonite family in Kansas. The sights and textures of Kansas farmland are interwoven with the struggles of conscience faced by

young men in time of war. From a plow in the sun-warmed soil of Kansas to the jungles of the Pacific to the sixties peace rally in Washington, D.C., you walk with father, son, and grandson in search for the way of peace."

Though it is not a *Gone With The Wind* kind of novel, I found the parts of particular interest which show the young men meeting the challenges to their faith, which they had taken for granted because of their upbringing, isolation and relative tolerance in this country in peace time.

The Mennonites (Anabaptists) had been persecuted in Europe and like others (the Amish, Coptic Christians, Quakers), when persecuted their faith was strong. When tolerated, exempted from military service and isolated, they did not face the challenges of violence to their pacifist beliefs. I wonder how we would have behaved had we grown up in Hitler's Germany.

Because Herald Press no longer carries this book, we are able to sell this \$10.00 book for \$2.00 plus \$1.00 postage and handling.

Jane Morgan

RECYCLED PAPER

We have decided to use recycled paper for our Newsletter, Booklist & brochure to save trees and pollution. However, until there is more demand for recycled paper, it means our costs are up. We ask that those of you who are able to do so, please consider increasing your tax-deductible membership contribution to Community Service when you renew your membership.

Community Service Newsletter

is published bi-monthly by
Community Service, Inc.
114 E. Whiteman Street
P. O. Box 243
Yellow Springs, OH 45387
513/767-2161 or 767-1461

Staff

Jane Morgan.....Editor
Carol Hill.....

Trustees

Phyllis Cannon, Jim & Cyndde DeWeese,
Helen Dunham, Victor Eyth, Agnes Gruliow,
Dick Hogan, Cecil Holland, John & Barbara
Holt, Sandra Landis, Jim Malarkey, Gerard
Poortinga, Jean Putnam, John Sakas, Tim
Sontag, Rod Wright.

Membership

Membership is a means of supporting and sharing the work of Community Service. The basic \$20 annual membership contribution includes a subscription to our bi-monthly NEWSLETTER and 10% off Community Service-published literature. Larger contributions are always needed, however, and smaller ones will be gladly accepted. Community Service is a nonprofit corporation which depends on contributions and the sale of literature to fund its work so that it can offer its services to those who need them. All contributions are appreciated, needed and tax-deductible. Due to added postage costs, overseas membership is \$25 in U.S. currency.

Have Your Friends Seen The Newsletter?

Please send the names and addresses of your friends who might enjoy receiving a sample NEWSLETTER and booklist. (If you wish specific issues sent, please send \$1 per copy.

Editor's Note

We welcome letters to the editor (under 300 words) and articles (700-2000 words) about any notable communities or people who are improving the quality of life in their communities. Please enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope if you wish the article returned. The only compensation we can offer is the satisfaction of seeing your words in print and knowing you have helped spread encouraging and/or educational information.

Editor's Note #2

We occasionally exchange our mailing list with a group with similar purposes such as the Arthur Morgan School at Celo or Communities Magazine. If you do not wish us to give your name to anyone, please let us know.

Address Change

If there is an error on your mailing label, please send the old label and any corrections to us promptly. It increases our cost greatly if the Post Office notifies us of moves, not to mention that we like hearing from our members and friends!

Consultation

Community Service makes no set charge for formal or informal consultation. Customarily, we ask for a contribution at a rate equal to the client's hourly earnings.

Contents

NEW LAND REFORM	Tom Watson	1
COMMUNITY LAND TRUST		4
SMALL TOWNS USA: A VANISHING BREED	Paul Greenberg	6
BOOK REVIEW: <u>New Age Community Guidebook</u>	John W. Blakelock	8
NEW LIFE COMMUNAL FARM NETWORK	Mark Sidles	9
READERS WRITE		10
ANNOUNCEMENTS		10

You can tell when your Community Service membership expires by looking at the month and year in the upper left corner of your mailing label. Please renew your membership now if it has expired or will expire before 4/90. The minimum membership contribution is \$20 per year. We do not send individual reminders to renew.

Community Service Inc.
P.O. Box 243
Yellow Springs, OH 45387

Address Correction Requested

